

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 were pending at the time of examination. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1-2, 5-6, 11 and 14-19, and canceled claims 7 and 10 from further consideration in this application. The Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-2, 5-6, 7, 10, 11 and 14-19 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 11 and 14-19 were amended and claims 7 and 10 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. The Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by these claims as presented prior to this Amendment and any additional claims in one or more continuing applications. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,230,160 B1 to Chan et al. (hereinafter “Chan”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,990,653 B1 to Burd et al. (hereinafter “Burd”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a given client can only call a user-defined set of specific server-side methods during a specific session.

While Chan, as the Examiner alleges, may show “application domain specific logic” and the generation of “appropriate middleware proxies,” there are no restrictions as to what methods the clients in Chan may call, as set forth in amended claim 1. Furthermore, Chan does not discuss session-specific methods, and certainly not session-specific methods that are further limited to only a set of specific server-side methods, as described in claim 1.

These deficiencies are also not cured by Burd, as Burd does not discuss what information is sent to the client, but only how the script is delivered. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

As was mentioned above, independent claim 17 contains similar limitations and was rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that at least for reasons similar to the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1,

the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 7 and 10 have been canceled in view of the amendments that were made to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-16 and 18-19 depend directly from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and contain further distinguishing limitations. Thus, for at least reasons substantially similar to those set forth above, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 2-16 and 18-19 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLLBORN PATENTS, INC

/Fredrik Mollborn/

Fredrik Mollborn  
Reg. No. 48,587

2840 Colby Drive  
Boulder, CO 80305  
(303) 459-4527